DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 826 UD 010 505

AUTHOR	Burke, David
TITLE	Upward Bound/Los Angeles County Probation Department Program Report.
INSTITUTION	Claremont Graduate School and Univ. Center, Calif.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	28p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Aspiration, Corrective Institutions, Counselor Evaluation, Decision Making, *Delinquent Rehabilitation, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Group Dynamics, Institutional Role, Probationary Period, Secondary Education, Social Differences, Student Adjustment, *Student Evaluation, Student Motivation, Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	California, Claremont Colleges, Los Angeles County Probation Department Program, *Upward Bound

ABSTRACT

During the summer of 1969, 16 youths from the Los Angeles County Probation Department's facilities participated in the Upward Bound program at the Claremont colleges together with 60 other students from surrounding communities. This program was established to provide the probation department with information useful in establishing similar joint programs with other private institutions. Goals of the program were to: motivate the probationers, raise educational aspirations, reduce contacts with the police, and reduce recidivism. Part I of the report contains impressions about the program gathered through interviews with students and staff. The findings were that: orientation and selection procedures were inadequate; some staff were too young, with a resulting lack of authority in handling behavior and discipline problems; and, the academic component was not sufficient. Students, however, felt the program was valuable and that a continuing relationship would be beneficial. Students also thought that their motivation and aspiration had increased, but doubted any effect on future recidivism. Part II of the report contains testing and personal data on the probationers, focusing on some intellectually talented youth. Part III contains program alternatives to counterproductive juvenile institutions. A bibliography is included. [Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document.] (Author/DM)

ED042826

UPWARD BOUND/LOS ANGELES COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT

PROGRAM REPORT

UD010505

Prepared by

David Burke

for the

Office of Research and Appraisal

Center for Educational Opportunity

1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Acknowledgments

I wish to acknowledge with pleasure the cooperation and support of the men and women who participated in the 1969 Upward Bound program, of the Center for Educational Opportunity at The Claremont Colleges, and of the staff at Camp Afflerbaugh and the Las Palmas School for Girls.

INTRODUCTION

The Claremont Upward Bound program had been in operation for three weeks when I was officially engaged to attempt an assessment of the Project as it involved Los Angeles County Probation youth. The nature of my assignment was left to me to define; and after extensive reading in the literature on juvenile delinquency and discussions with Octavio Boubion, Director of Upward Bound, and Dennis Spuck, Director of the Research and Appraisal Office of the Center for Educational Opportunity, I concluded that although I could not measure fully the impact of the program on the young men and women, I could collect impressions. Such impressions (gathered through interviews with the students, program staff, and County Probation officials) make up a great part of Part One of this report, and most assuredly affected my subjective views on the impact and value of the program.

Part Two results from a decision to gather some baseline data in order to begin to determine more clearly certain characteristics of the population in Camp Afflerbaugh and Las Palmas, and is here presented with the hope that it may, in providing more information on the youth, enable the writers of future programs to tailor their efforts more closely to the apparent abilities and needs of youth in detention.

Part Three contains suggestions which may be seen as building on the foundation already laid by the Center for Educational Opportunity and the Los Angeles County Probation Department in Project Upward Bound during the Summer, 1969; and results from my conviction that it is imperative to carefully develop proposals and projects directly to meet the needs of delinquent youth, and indirectly to aid in ameliorating conditions in this society that militate against the successful rehabilitation of youthful offenders.

During the Summer of 1969, sixteen youth (six were female, ten male) from the Los Angeles County Probation Department's facilities at Camp Afflerbaugh and the Las Palmas School for Girls were chosen to participate in the Upward Bound program operated at The Claremont Colleges. Upward Bound had an enrollment of sixty students, most of whom lived in the suburban communities of Pomona, Montclair, Claremont, Ontario, Chino, and Cucamonga. All participants were to meet OEO income criteria. The program is part of a national operation, now under the direction of the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and designed to provide pre-college experience for capable disadvantaged youth in senior high school. The goals of the proposal were stated as follows:

1. To motivate youth on probation to continue their education in the community after they are released from camp.

2. To raise the level of educational aspiration of probation youth.

3. To reduce their contacts with the police.

4. To reduce recidivism.

The program was specifically established to provide the Probation Department with information that could prove useful in establishing joint programs of a similar nature with other private institutions. According to the proposal there were eleven specific objectives which, if achieved, would ensure that the aforementioned goals had been attained. Those objectives related primarily to initiating positive changes in attitudes on the part of the youth, the establishing of areas of cooperation between the County Probation Department and the Center for Educational Opportunity, and the obtaining of additional knowledge about youth on probation, their potential, and their needs.

I interviewed the students in the sixth and last week of the program. Interviews were also conducted after the program closed. There was no interview schedule, though there were areas of concern which were dealt with in every interview. The students' perceptions were surprisingly uniform. With the exception of disagreements about the academic components of the program, the interviews had shown sufficient clarity and uniformity that I can here write their responses as if they had been reported out of committee. They had apparently arrived independently at something approaching a consensus. They were serious, well-informed, genuinely concerned, and thorough. It was my impression that, given the resources, they could easily have put a program together themselves. In fact they had indirectly taken the Upward Bound program apart and had put it together again.

Let me stress again that the following remarks are paraphrased from notes recorded during interviews with the probation wards in the Upward Bound program. As such they must be recognized as the students' perception of the program. I paraphrase their remarks here because they were cogent and best expressed the students' needs--in terms of such a program as Upward Bound. Although critical in tone, they reflect a serious and thoughtful concern that the program build on the strengths and compensate for its weaknesses. The students engaged, in the best possible manner, in truly constructive criticism.

UPWARD BOUND
PROBATION DEPARTMENT REPORT

PART I

On Selection

It was agreed that selection procedures were weak. More information concerning each and every possible student should be gathered and more care ought to be exercised in their selection. Income criteria should play a lesser role in admission procedures. Greater consideration ought to be placed on psychological adjustment factors as they affect each individual. The initial selection procedure could be based on tests, and student achievement and adjustment. It was felt that a greater degree of cooperation and communication between the Probation staff and Upward Bound would result in selections that would guarantee better results. One respondent suggested that the search for likely students ought not to be confined solely to Afflerbaugh or Las Palmas; that, if resources were available, they would be well spent in searching the whole county system for likely candidates.

On Orientation

It was generally agreed that orientation procedures were inadequate. Responses to questions on this matter ranged from a statement that nothing at all had been done, to many which showed agreement with the belief that what had been done was insufficient. It was felt that more information should be made available to those admitted to the program; and whatever information is made available ought to correspond more closely to reality. Not only was it suggested that the orientation for incoming students be more elaborate, but that it involve staff of the cooperating Probation Department institutions and Upward Bound as well. The staff at Afflerbaugh and Las Palmas should have been more fully informed on the nature and the purpose of the project, according to the interviews. In addition the staff of Upward Bound ought to have obtained a thorough introduction to the ways of life at the two detention facilities. The point was made repeatedly in this and other contexts, that the immediate background of the probation youth was critically important insofar as their expectations, concerns, and felt needs were related directly to their behavior both in and out of detention, and that an understanding of that background would be of particular importance to staff in projects such as Upward Bound. Such an understanding could be obtained from conferences with probation staff, from visits to the facilities, from whatever means could be used to facilitate communication between and among cooperating institutions. Orientation was felt to be critically important in that if handled properly, it honestly could provide the basis of the program's success. As will be noted later, probation youth felt the program to be partially inadequate, specifically because promises in the form of threatened sanctions were made and then broken. They further suggest that if no hard lines are drawn from the very first in orientation, the program is bound to have problems.

On the Staff

The interviewee's responses to questions concerning the staff must remain, given the purposes of the report, of a general nature. All references to individuals were deliberately excluded, though much of the criticism of staff was organized in terms of specific individuals. In addition this criticism of staff is difficult to separate out from criticism of the program. With these qualifications in mind we can discuss the students' response to staff.

Concern about the quality of the staff was strong. There was little criticism of the program director and assistant director, but the tutor, counselors, and teaching staff were the subject of complaints. Specifically, it was suggested that the relative youthfulness of the tutor-counselor staff contributed to a too great involvement with students, and a corresponding lack of authority when behavior or discipline problems among students disrupted the program. Many staff members, it was felt, were not prepared for the program, certainly not for dealing with probation youth, and as a result compromised themselves and the program.

The teaching staff was seen as generally competent, though there were specific complaints concerning particular classes. A general criticism voiced by most interviewees was that the academic component was not emphasized sufficiently, hence the program lacked authenticity in terms of its engagement in learning experiences at the college and university level. (I should note here that these youth were very experienced in the art of voicing what they believed their interviewer would like to hear.)

It was suggested that the staff be better chosen; exhibit more professionalism (particularly if they are to act as counselors); that they work with probation staff prior to the program's beginning; that no new staff be allowed to join the program after it commences; that they assume more responsibility and authority in directing program affairs; and that students be allowed to help direct those affairs.

The one overriding expressed concern was that the staff "tell it straight", and act on what it says. There was much discussion of the "hyprocrisy" of the staff in setting limits, declaring punishments, and then failing to act when the limits were challenged, and punishment was called for. There was evident, outstanding concern that the staff be intensely committed to the enterprise, and that they be absolutely honest, and real--that there be no difference between what they seem to be and what they are, and perhaps most important, that limits be set and maintained.

Homogeneous or Heterogeneous Groups?

Evidence from the interviews suggests that the mixed group is an unmixed blessing. Perhaps "blessing" is too strong a word, but the probation youth agreed that the engagement of "dudes and chicks" (themselves) with "squares", "straights", and "suburban types" (most Upward Bound participants came from the Pomona Valley) gave them a valuable chance to test their aptitudes and abilities in moving in a different world than the one to which they were accustomed. The startlingly strong and positive response in the interviews to this subject suggests that it may be peculiarly useful to develop programs involving the interaction of probation youth with straight kids, squares, men and women in their twenties and thirties, both from the "street" and otherwise.

The experience of this heterogeneous mixing was seen as liberating by the probation youth. In part because they came on as a group, they made an impact on the summer program despite their numbers, and they gained because of that impact. The program may have seemed to have suffered, but the effect on many of the probation youth was exhilarating, and reports from the other youth engaged in the summer program indicate that they felt too the value of the heterogeneous mixing.

When pressed for specifics to support this generalization concerning the value of the heterogeneous group, the dudes and chicks listed the following:

1. "I was able to see myself as others saw me, other straight kids."

2. "It makes a difference to know you're not really different."

3. "I began to see how I might fit in a society."

4. "The split between camp people and outsiders made the program tougher but more meaningful."

There were specific suggestions that the fact of the "split" group be capitalized on in guided group interaction sessions. Apparently some "outsiders" never were able to get beyond or beneath the "tough" exterior of the camp people; likewise, some camp kids were unable to go beyond the label of "straight", "square", or "unhip" in thinking of non-probation youth in Upward Bound. Generally as noted, the positive attitudes of probationers regarding the mixed group was echoed by the other Upward Bound participants.

On Program

For a variety of reasons (among them the too youthful, inexperienced staff, or inadequate orientation, the sudden confrontation of life style between the "camp" youth and "outsiders") most interviewees felt the program was inadequate in terms of its stated purposes.

They called it "doing your own thing", and most seemed disturbed by the fact that the reality of the program in operation neither matched their preconceptions of what the program was to be, nor appeared congruent with the rhetoric of the program's staff and director. All, however, agreed when interviewed in the program's sixth week that, although the first five weeks had been disorganized, they had experienced enough in the program to draw them back after the program had been dissolved at the end of five weeks; and that as a result of their return and the staff's "getting it together", the sixth week made the whole experience worthwhile. It may suffice to say that the individual student's experience of Upward Bound was the more meaningful as a result of the mistakes and errors made in programming the first few weeks of Upward Bound.

From the point of view of the probation youth, the program was not what it had been made out to be. Yet they maintained that this experience in Upward Bound was a valuable one. They were able to carefully distinguish between actual experience and program plans, and pointed out that the mistakes made in structuring the program in no way belied the commitment and essential good sense of the director and staff, that in fact, precisely because of the rewarding experience of working through the program's various faults with staff, they came to feel such commitment to the program that they wanted to stay.

Specifically, the most important expressed concern of the probationers was that the program was not structured carefully or precisely enough in regard to controls and sanctions. No one knew where they stood. Threats were not effective for they were never enforced. (The director claimed on the other hand that they were actually enforced.) Limits were not definitively and clearly established before the program began. Participating democracy in such a project just simply is not feasible. The idea that students discipline themselves was seen as laughable. "Why should I get myself out of here when I get money every week, and a roof, food, and drink, and can do damn near anything I please?"

For the most part, the students expressed what they knew, and their view of an institution was that it should be, had to be, authoritarian, repressive, punitive. Is that not what institutions had always been for them? Yet there was a kernel of truth in their pleas (that is what they amounted to) for a structured order, discipline, control, standards, and limits. To individuals who have long operated within systems and institutions that function in an authoritarian fashion it is not given that they can accept fully (if at all) a permissive, unstructured environment, particularly one they are suddenly thrust into. Moreover, the program was in no way restructured for the probation youth--who admitted they needed within the program some things the squares did not.

Their suggestions for change included simplification and communication as essential elements. Before the program began all involved should have known precisely what was permissible and what was not; what the sanctions were; the purposes

of the program and how they were to be achieved; and who was responsible for what. A simple system of rewards and punishments would have been advisable. Money and privileges could be granted for successful engagement in various program components. Fines and expulsion would serve as specific, absolute, disciplinary sanctions; there would be no appeal. The student ought to accept, according to probationers, the terms of the contract with Upward Bound, or reject them.

Other suggestions concerned constructing a more intensive academic component within Upward Bound; establishing a guided group interaction component; allowing participants to continue the program beyond the six week limit in the summer; and integrate the program with a more intensive and supportive school year program.

It is significant that there were no requests from respondents for more participation in governing the program; for a more liberal program; for more freedom from staff contact within the program; or in fact, for any radical alteration or reform of the program. It was apparent that the students had thought long and talked hard about the program, and had reached quite definite, well reasoned conclusions. Their major premise was that the program presented an opportunity and only that, and a man ought to live up to it or leave. Simple, not simplistic. But a question arises concerning their responses to the experience of Upward Bound. If the experience of the program as it occurred was regarded as valuable, would similar value come within the framework of a more structured program? There was an implicit contradiction apparent in the young rebels and freedom seekers suggesting a more authoritarian, carefully structured program with express and absolute sanction and control systems.

On the Other Upward Bound Students

The perceptions of probationers on the subject of the heterogeneous mix in the population of Upward Bound has already been reported. From written responses to questions put to them at the end of the program, the students in Upward Bound other than the probationers sketched their impressions of the summer program.

In response to a question on the value of engaging probation youth in the program, almost without exception, the students responded favorably, indicating they believed the experience was "beneficial", "positive", "an asset", although there were a few who suggested that the program's difficulties were somehow the fault of the probation youth. Most, however, did not subscribe to that notion and suggested that their experience was richer for contact with probation youth. They mirrored in fact the probationer's response to the same question. The tensions, conflict, and anxiety that some said resulted from the presence of the probationers were denied by most, and the probationers' own perception of their impact on the program--that it was generally substantial and beneficial--was supported by most of the other students. Probationers were seen as more experienced, mature, and helpful, because of their "street" experience. Their impact on the program, it was suggested by some, was to make it more honest, more real.

In other respects the reports of the Upward Bound students support the contentions of the probationers regarding the program. The program's weakest points were seen to be disorganization and lack of structure; lack of discipline and unclear lines of authority; and ill-defined areas of responsibility. The program's positive effects were seen to result from the opportunity to engage with good people in a common enterprise, some of the classes and "rap" sessions, activities, and a chance to learn something about oneself. The program was generally seen to flounder for the first four-five weeks, and the staff was seen to be somewhat disorganized and to suffer from their own apparently confused attitudes toward exercising authority; the most important outcome of the program was expressed in terms of acquiring knowledge about oneself and about some educational possibilities available, as well as about various academic subjects. It was evident that though most found flaws in the program they all felt the experience to be valuable, at the least a more exciting and profitable way to spend the summer than usual, and at most an experience perceived as effecting substantial change in attitudes and behavior.

On Post-Program Affairs

There was no question on the part of the students that a continuing relationship with Upward Bound would be beneficial. It was felt that the program's impact and value would not sustain itself without the additional impetus of further contact and support from Upward Bound. Those, who at the time of interviewing were slated for involvement in another special program, were not concerned about maintaining relations with Upward Bound; but they, as well as the others, suggested that a single six week program without follow through would be insufficient in terms of the program's stated objectives.

The program, as originally envisioned, contained provisions for maintaining contact and providing additional support services for probationers; but in fact beyond what could be accomplished in the way of some encouragement and support to apply to other programs, return to Upward Bound next summer, or help in obtaining entry to another CEO program, there was little, given the available resources, the Upward Bound staff could do. Such a situation certainly is not optimal in terms of providing probation youth with real opportunities to break out of the cycle they are caught in.

Realizing this, the youth involved, though they felt that they could do little materially to affect societal conditions, expressed both fear and hope, fear that once given a taste of another life it would be withdrawn, and they would be returned to their "old" existences, shuffled about as pawns by society's bureaucrats; and hope that there would be enough of a link to the real possibilities Upward Bound held out, so they could sustain themselves when back "on the street", or "in the old neighborhood".

There was interest in having weekend programs at Claremont during the school year; or in joining other similar organizations at locations nearer their residences; or in the possibilities of the probation department establishing a control "counseling center or workshop".

As it turns out, of the eleven (of the original sixteen) who remained in the program, two joined the High School Equivalency Program and passed their GED and are now preparing for the SAT; one was admitted to Pitzer College under the sponsorship of the Program for Special Directed Studies; two are still involved in the Upward Bound school year program at Claremont; one is now doing "B" work in her senior year in high school; four have not maintained contact; and one has returned to camp.

On Inter-Organizational Coordination

One of the objectives of the probationers in Upward Bound program was to help develop a working relationship between the Los Angeles County Probation Department and the Center for Educational Opportunity and The Claremont Colleges with a view towards building a basis for an extended relationship. In terms of the operation of the program, there was little formalized interaction between the respective staffs of the two cooperating institutions. Since the program ended, however, there have been more contacts made, and apparently a basis for communication and cooperation does exist.

From the point of view of the young men and women engaged in the program, there was insufficient cooperation between the Los Angeles Probation Department and Upward Bound. When asked for suggestions regarding virtually any phase or component of the program, many of the interviewees commented that the staff at "camp" ought to be involved. Specifically, it was suggested that the Upward Bound staff would have been better had there been a probation officer engaged to work in the program. Probationers apparently believed there were specific individuals at Camp Afflerbaugh and Las Palmas who would have provided both the probationers and others in the program with valuable leadership. With great emphasis it was recurrently suggested that the staffs at "camp" should have been more and better informed, and could have played an important role not only in orientation programs, but also in the whole Upward Bound operation. The probationers seemed to feel a need for some sort of program overlap, for much of the criticism of the Upward Bound program was couched in terms of their probation experiences, and that fact can in part, (though not entirely) be explained in terms of their limited points of reference.

There was a difference too between the Las Palmas and the Afflerbaugh groups. The girls from Las Palmas generally regarded their probation experience at the school favorably, which was not true of the Afflerbaugh boys. But most individuals in each group suggested that visible signs of a closer relationship between the two institutions would have helped the program.

On Student Assessment of Program Impact

The students were asked to assess the program in terms of the goals outlined in the program proposal, to wit:

1. To motivate youth on probation to continue their education in the community after they are released from camp.

2. To raise the level of educational aspiration of probation youth.

3. To reduce their contacts with police, and;

4. To reduce recidivism.

All probationers interviewed felt an increased motivation on their part to finish their education, and reported that their "level of aspiration" had been raised. In other words, those who had been content to rest on their educational record (only one had finished high school) now not only wanted to finish high school, but also spoke of continuing beyond high school, either in a junior college, trade school, or a four year college or university. They saw as a real possibility a chance for a college education or training beyond high school. They in fact considered such an expansion of vision to be Upward Bound's major achievement. It was related to their self-perceived, renewed and strengthened self-concepts, and to the vision Upward Bound had provided of what might be possible. The fact that they could operate in the world and do so well was proof of their abilities; and the information obtained at Upward Bound concerning college and post-high school training made them aware of possibilities that they hitherto had no knowledge of.

But the idea that transient involvement in an Upward Bound program would have some effect on whether they "get in trouble again" was for the most part rejected. Most probationers suggested that, given a renewed interest in school and some support from their probation officers, they would be less likely to make contact with the police than had they simply been turned out of camp; however, if they were to return to their "street", they would inevitably get "hassled" or "busted" again; and the implication was that the program was useful for some of its stated purposes, but not for others. In their eyes it did not follow that, given motivation to make it in school, one would thus be less likely to get in trouble with the law.

They were surprised in fact to find that program planners had linked the two objectives (increase motivation and reduce recidivism) at all. They know something that planners do not.

Overall ratings of the program as an experience were generally quite favorable, despite the detailed and lengthy criticism of various and sundry components of the program. Upward Bound was rated high because it provided an unusual opportunity for probationers to come to terms with themselves and with the straight world's representatives, and it was commended by probationers for just those reasons. Therein is the lesson of Upward Bound.

On Structure and Student Participation

As has been noted repeatedly in these pages, the probationers were specifically concerned that Upward Bound did not provide them with sufficient direction and structure. The complaint that the program was "too loose", was introduced in part because the probationers have come from a "total institution". But the complaints were lodged not simply against orientation procedures, staffing or whatever, but against the very structure of the experience, and that must be seriously considered.

Given the operation of Upward Bound as an ongoing program, the probationers were not suggesting that it be abandoned and replaced, simply that more thought be given to altering the structure to phase in probation youth. They suggested that a more carefully structured and authoritarian system would better meet their needs. As one interviewer put it, "participatory democracy just won't work. If you want us to work in an open program you better let us get there gradually". None suggested a rigid, heavily authoritarian structure, but all were concerned (as is so far evident in this report) with setting clearly defined limits of behavior, and establishing absolutely clear lines of authority and responsibility.

None suggested that students not participate fully in decision processes; in fact they all suggested that a strong point in their actual experience in Upward Bound was such involvement for it made them responsible for the program in a realistic way. Yet it was too much too soon, and as a result, according to the probationers, the program floundered. One suggestion endorsed by most interviewees involved developing a phased program in which students are at first given little responsibility for the program's operation, or for codes of behavior; instead, tested for their willingness to accept their assigned responsibilities, a proven willingness and ability to accept responsibility would then allow for the gradual assumption of greater and greater shares of responsibility and power in terms of operating the program, and dealing with one another.

Yet a curious fact emerges; most students became as involved in the actual program as they did because of the loose structure and organization. The experience took on added value, in fact was qualitatively different, better, than any previous experience with institutions because of its organizational deficiencies and structure defects. Because of the looseness it was a test.

Summary and Comment

The probationers found the program to be on the whole a valuable experience. While they offered numerous, specific, and sharp criticisms of all aspects of the program, they all affirmed that they would rather have participated in the program than not. They also viewed the program as a foundation on which better programs could be built and expressed the hope that this beginning effort would not be written off because of the mistakes made. They were perceptive and careful in their criticism, and although they could not in many cases have known the causes underlying the program's failings, they could and did delineate those failings with precision, and were willing to offer suggestions for treatment of the program's ills. I would suggest that their perceptions, as outlined here, be taken seriously, and offer as well the suggestion that, in the case of building new programs, the involvement of one or more of the probationers on a consultant basis could prove fruitful.

Throughout the interviews I was impressed by the probationers' openness, honesty, and tough-mindedness. The most consistent and telling criticism of Upward Bound came in the form of remarks about the failure to "say it straight". They did not ask for special favors, free form adventures in learning or personal development, nor were they at all unwilling to assume responsibility for whatever went "wrong" in the program, or in their personal lives while "in" the program. They expressed a great desire for honesty, and for absolute congruence between appearance and reality. They did not care for staff who were confused about their own identity, or unclear about the program's purposes, nor were they enthusiastic about participating in a program that itself seemed confused. In short, they were desirous of establishing a trusting relationship--with each other, the program, and the staff, and were willing to go to great lengths themselves to ensure the possibility of such relationships. Withal, they were human, and themselves confused, in part aware of that, and did not ask for an ideal program, only for one that was what it appeared to be.

The program's measurable success would probably lay in changes in attitude toward and knowledge about the possibilities for education as they may affect individuals in American society. Thus the more valuable components of the program included the evening classes, visiting lecturers, trips, and for some, the group "rap" sessions. As a result of the experience, participants felt an increased commitment to continue their education, and an increased awareness of what was possible in terms of educating or training themselves. There was no pretense that the experience "rehabilitated" them insofar as their attitudes toward drugs, sex, and petty crimes were concerned. Not that their attitudes remained the same, but only that whatever effect the experience had, it was not immediate nor powerful as evidenced by behavioral change while in the program, and their somewhat grim appraisals of what was likely to occur when they returned to their home community were, I believe, quite realistic.

Regarding the concept of community, it seemed that the probationers, though they mentioned it not once in their interviews, were quite pleased with the spirit of community that developed within the Upward Bound milieu. There were, of course, at first the separate communities consisting of probationers, the insiders, the group of "straights", the outsiders, and the staff. But before the program ended,

the lines blurred, and as apparent from interviews with probationers, and the questionnaires filled in by other program participants, most of the people in the program felt communally included in the experiment of Upward Bound, totally involved and individually responsible. The fact that newly released probationers engaged in a common enterprise with "square", suburban youth, and that such an experience was seen as a valuable part of the Upward Bound experience by nearly all participants, speaks volumes about the need of youth in regard to acquiring a sense of community. This must be ranked, though it may not be easily defined, nor easily measurable, as one of the important achievements of the Upward Bound/Probation experiment.

The program should continue. There are particular services that can be rendered by The Claremont Colleges and the CEO to the delinquent community, and this program can stand as it was intended to stand as a first effort at cooperation between particular private institutions of higher learning and the Los Angeles County Probation Department. There is much that must be done, and there is no lack of good reasons for a continued cooperative effort on the part of both institutions; in fact the Upward Bound/Probation experimant can only be regarded as an opportunity, one which surely needs to be taken advantage of.

A proper extension of the program would guarantee the cooperating institutions sufficient lead time to prepare adequately. The basic format of the Upward Bound program could well be maintained; the mixing of "straight" youth and probationers is advantageous; the academic component of the program should be emphasized more; a clearly defined system of sanctions ought to be established; a more highly professional staff is essential; orientation for probationers and staff of cooperating institutions ought to be strengthened; some effort must be made to either develop an open ended program, or establish supports for the Upward Bound youth in the community during the school year; cooperation and the exchange of information between the cooperating institutions should be further developed; and a comprehensive, thorough, and highly professional research component ought to be an integral part of any extended or modified program. In short, a refined program would simply build on the strengths, and attempt to eliminate the weaknesses of the pilot effort. The available evidence suggests that the possible rewards for such an effort would far outweigh the resources expended in developing and operating such a program.

UPWARD BOUND
PROBATION DEPARTMENT REPORT

PART II

SURVEY

Baseline Data

During the fall of 1969 the Research and Appraisal Office of the Center for Educational Opportunity attempted to gather information on the populations at Camp Afflerbaugh and the Las Palmas School for Girls of the Los Angeles County Probation Department. Rather than rely solely on the records available at the two detention facilities, we requested some time be made available to the wards for the purpose of filling out questionnaires and taking tests. A questionnaire was devised, a STEP (Standard Test of Educational Potential) reading exam, and two SCAT (Scholastic College Achievement Test) exams--Verbal and Mathematical--were administered at both facilities. At Camp Afflerbaugh, the California Test of Personality was also administered.

Data gathering at such facilities is not as simple as it would seem. To youngsters not at all accustomed (much less inclined) to pay attention to pencil and paper instruments, the assignment of a questionnaire, or exam, is viewed simply as a waste of time, particularly if no material reward is immediately given. So in many particulars the results of our survey can be questioned--in terms of the inadequate number of responses, as well as the quality of response (whether well intentioned and honest or not). This then is a caveat: there is no claim being made for the completeness or reliability of the data here gathered and presented.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Camp Afflerbaugh, at the time of our appearance, had eighty-seven probationers in detention, all save four were made available for our purposes. Las Palmas had ninety wards, all save six were available. The data gathering team spent one day at Camp Afflerbaugh, and two half days at Las Palmas. You will note that the girls at Las Palmas responded in much greater proportions to the questions than did the boys at Camp Afflerbaugh. Las Palmas, with its fund of available data, can also check the responses of the girls. Camp Afflerbaugh is hindered in so doing by not having available as much in the way of information on its wards. And the inadequate response (as much the fault of the test givers as the youth) of the Afflerbaugh boys invalidates whatever pretension to completeness and accuracy this survey may have had. Nevertheless the information we did gather may prove useful.

	Camp Afflerbaugh	Las Palmas
Age	17.1 mean 16 - 18 range (52 observations)	15.8 mean 13 - 18 range (85 observations)
Highest Grade Completed	10.3 mean 8 - 12 range (51 observations)	10.0 mean 7 - 12 range (84 observations)

Arrests
(reported by respondents)

Drugs	17		21
Grand Theft	4	Sexual Delinquency	2
Burglary, Robbery	7		3
Receiving Stolen Goods	-		-
Drink	4		1
Truant/Runaway	2		36
Disturbing Peace/Curfew/Loiter	-		1
Assault/Poss. of Deadly Weapons	1	Viol. of Probation	10
Joy Riding/Driving w/out License	-		-
Other/Combination	16		2
	(51 observations)		(76 observations)

Number of Arrests	7.5 mean 1 - 30 range	4.8 mean 1 - 27 range
Father's Age	46.7 mean 29 - 63 range (39 observations)	45.5 mean 22 - 64 range (?) (70 observations)
Mother's Age	42.7 mean 27 - 61 range (?) (45 observations)	42.4 mean 30 - 59 range (77 observations)

	Camp Afflerbaugh	Las Palmas
Parents' Marital Status	of 51 observations--25 living together, 7 separated, 12 divorced and 7 widowed	of 81 observations--33 living together, 4 separated, 39 divorced and 5 widowed
Father's Occupation (Ranked according to Socioeconomic Index for Occupations - Occupation and Social Status, Albert J. Reiss, Jr., Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1961)	41.8 mean 22.54 std. dev. 7 - 82 range (39 observations)	42.54 mean 21.70 std. dev. 0 - 93 range (61 observations)
	36 - 46 on the Socioeconomic Index includes transportation workers, clerical and kindred, craftsmen, some foremen, some sales people, sales clerks, repairmen, restaurant and retail trade workers, machinists and toolmakers, railroad employees such as brakemen. (Note the range at Las Palmas.)	
Father's Education	10.66 grades (3 of 39 observations finished college)	12.07 grades (10 of 55 observations finished college, one attended beyond BA)
Mother's Education	11.48 grades (1 of 43 observations finished college)	11.92 grades (8 of 69 observations finished college)
Number of persons at home	4.4 (13 with 7 - 10 people in home) (50 observations)	4.4 (11 with 6 or more people in home) (84 observations)
Number of Siblings	3.8 (51 observations)	3.3 (85 observations)
Other Languages	15 of 52 observations rated languages other than English in home	27 of 55 observations rated languages other than English in home

	Camp Afflerbaugh	Las Palmas
Plan to return to school	49 of 50 respondents replied Yes	84 of 85 respondents replied Yes
How far do you plan to go in school?	1 would quit	--
	11 go on to finish HS	11
	22 trade, tech or JC	42
	14 interested in college	24
	2 interested in Grad. School or professional training	8
	(50 observations)	(85 observations)
Work Experience	42 have held jobs (47 observations)	57 have held jobs (80 observations)

SEQUENTIAL TESTS OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS

CONVERTED READING SCORES

	National Norms (entering grade 10)	Urban Norms (1963) (entering grade 10)	Camp Afflerbaugh (N = 50)	Las Palmas (N = 60)
Mean	283	289	283	283
Median	285	292	283	283
Min. Score			248	252
Max. Score			314	316
Lower Quartile	273	278	272	274
Upper Quartile	297	302	297	292

10 Afflerbaugh students scored above 300 which, even in 12th grade scores would rank @ 53% or above in comparison to National Norms

6 Las Palmas girls scored 300 or more

SCHOOL AND COLLEGE ABILITY TEST

CONVERTED VERBAL SCORE

	Urban Norms (midyear grade 10)	Urban Norms (entering grade 11)	Camp Afflerbaugh (N = 35)	Las Palmas (N = 62)
Mean	279	283	280	282
Min. Score	244	-	258	260
Max. Score	313	-	315	310
Lower Quartile	268	271	271	276
Upper Quartile	289	294	287	289

CONVERTED MATH SCORE

	Urban Norms (entering grade 10)	Urban Norms (midyear grade 10)	Camp Afflerbaugh (N = 35)	Las Palmas (N = 42)
Mean	289	293	285	290
Min. Score	-	258	252	257
Max. Score	-	333	317	322
Lower Quartile	277	279	273	277
Upper Quartile	301	307	297	301

It seems apparent that the populations at Camp Afflerbaugh and at Las Palmas approximate the norm in terms of their abilities as measured by STEP and SCAT. It also is evident that there is a range of abilities, and that range includes some intellectually talented youngsters, thus providing support for assumptions underlying attempts to develop programs for such youth.

Such a survey as was attempted can only be seen as but the merest beginning. Further and more carefully developed research efforts could, in the way of a talent search, identify youth with marked creative and intellectual capabilities, and lay the groundwork for a significant rescue operation.

(Note: the printout and the data decks from which was drawn the above information are available at the Research and Appraisal office of the Center for Educational Opportunity.)

UPWARD BOUND
PROBATION DEPARTMENT REPORT

PART III

Notes on Program Possibilities

Communities usually compound their failures when a "juvenile offender" is committed to an institution and made subject to what generally passes for rehabilitation efforts. If any given community fails to take juvenile criminal behavior and the problems attendant upon its correction and control seriously, it cannot itself be taken seriously and will not long survive. And while we write and talk, the problem grows beyond urgency to crisis. More youth turn to drugs. Middle class delinquency increases. Cities riot. The social institutions that serve youth fail in as many ways as there are ways to fail. If this seems to be the rhetoric of apocalypse, then read the Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, prepared for the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice in 1967. The situation has not improved since then.

On the basis of that report, and a selective review of the literature, some judgments can be made regarding the present status of juvenile correction and rehabilitation efforts in the U. S. It is generally agreed that traditional forms of incarceration in custodial institutions are not of great value. They simply do not work. They are, in the jargon of the social scientists, counterproductive. It would not be much of an exaggeration to suggest that, were someone to design a system for the express purposes of reinforcing youthful criminal behavior patterns, providing environments conducive to the development of anti-social attitudes and behaviors, and wasting material and human resources in as extravagant a fashion as possible, he could do little better than to copy our existing systems for coping with juvenile crime, correction, and rehabilitation.

Without evidence to suggest that it works, we have allowed to be constructed a massive, unimodal, correctional establishment. The evidence available, poor though it is, unequivocably suggests that prevailing current approaches in juvenile corrections do not work. Were we to dissolve the entire apparatus that inflicts itself upon society in the guise of juvenile court and correctional systems, we might find ourselves safer, saner, richer, better off in every way. We would do better, in short, were we to do nothing.

In the past decade and a half, some alternative modes have emerged for dealing with the problem of the rehabilitation of juvenile offenders. They have not, despite their apparent success and attractiveness, become widespread. But they exist, and can provide us with models, or with elements for building other alternative models. The prevailing unimodal juvenile correction system consists of juvenile courts, custodial treatment centers, and a probation operation. The juvenile court system is under attack, for it dispenses with constitutional guarantees; custodial treatment centers are seen as greatly responsible for absurdly high recidivism rates; and probation programs all over the country are vastly overloaded, and may in fact be irrelevant to the rehabilitation of youthful offenders.

I have suggested one alternative already. Do away with the system. In fact the New York Family Court Act allows for a "no disposition" judgment following a judicial determination of fact. The accused offender, whether guilty or not, simply has his day in court. But that does not speak to our needs. Two other approaches which can be mined for the purpose of building effective post-institutional programs involve (1) the use of the delinquent as charge agent (as in Synanon, for instance), usually supplemented by a guided group interaction model, and (2) community treatment programs and centers in which delinquents function in the community (rather than comprising their own, total community--as in Synonan) and in treatment centers, as in the Provo experiment and Essexfields. The California Youth Authority's recent experimentation with its "Community Treatment Project" may offer itself as a valuable alternative.

But there has been little effort to specify and locate talent from within incarcerated populations, or to build programs to tap institutionalized populations, and to develop the human resources therein. In this country, only Highfields in New Jersey, and Kentfields in Michigan have attempted to provide a support program to enable delinquents to break out of their cyclical trap, and into an educational opportunity program. Both programs developed out of the Essexfields model, but emphasized continued education, rather than employment (though that was also built into their program), as the focus of the project. Both used a fraternity like setting, sent youth into the community, provided them with learning situations (using programmed texts, trips, speakers, and connections with local colleges, trade and technical schools, and government training programs), and remained open ended; that is, an individual could return to the "house" when he saw fit, when he felt he required the sort of support the "house" was able to give.

California stands in a unique position in regard to juvenile detention and correction. In many ways it has led the nation in attempts to innovate on a large scale. The California Youth Authority has undertaken serious research efforts and is beginning to learn what works and what does not in its detention facilities and rehabilitation programs. But the need for information is great. Efforts must be made to develop the research capacities of the institutions engaged in juvenile work, to locate and engage research facilities outside the system, and to develop programs in conjunction with such research that will test alternative techniques of control and rehabilitation in serious ways.

Insofar as a relationship between the Center for Educational Opportunity and the Los Angeles County Probation Department exists, it can be developed to the benefit of both institutions (not to mention the presumed benefit of the youth) in a variety of ways. I wish to discuss three: cooperative research efforts in the detention facilities, in particular relating to the training and education of county probation program personnel; experimentation within the probation department's facilities in the development of alternative modes of training and education; and experimentation and development in community based educational opportunity programs.

Research Efforts Within Department Facilities

As suggested in Part II of this report, some attempt must be made to determine as precisely and carefully as possible just who the wards of the Probation Department are, and what they may be capable of intellectually. We can no longer afford the assumption (not supported by what little evidence we have) that they are somehow different, much less that they are inferior in some ineffable way. The population of the camps is changing. It would be wise to monitor that change. Not only would such information as gathered in a thorough survey and testing of camp population be useful to program planning and development, it would also be quite valuable to staff engaged in the ongoing affairs of camp and probation outreach facilities. Focusing a careful attention on the creative and intellectual abilities and interests of youthful offenders would result in a store of information quite useful in changing present programs, as well as in developing additional programs, and in utilizing existing community resources in the effort to restore such offenders to their rightful place in society.

A system wide testing and evaluation program would involve simple pencil and paper instruments, and could if properly set up, aid in amassing the baseline data that is not presently available. Such a program would include: the administration of questionnaires designed to elicit such information as would be pertinent to a study of the school backgrounds, educational aspirations, and present perceived educational and intellectual status of the delinquent; the testing of academic achievement, intellectual capabilities, and creative proclivities of the Department's wards; and assessing the impact of the Department's own educational and training programs.

As part of such an effort, an intensive effort to develop, study, and utilize knowledge about one or two particular camps or schools in depth as regards the facilities' relation to the youth that they serve in terms of its educational program, and as regards the characteristics of the youth, their relative giftedness or lack of it, their histories, their personalities, and as regards the impact of the probation experience <u>over time</u> (say three to five years) would be immensely valuable. Such a program of research could provide corroboration of the results of the system wide research results, and would in addition provide sufficient evidence to ensure support of newly developed programs, particularly if experimental in nature, and responsive to the perceived needs of the Department. In addition the bank of data accumulated could be used to aid in developing probation programs for specific individuals, in particular as those programs contain educational components.

Intra-Departmental Experiments in Education

Given the wide variety of educational innovations (in methods, technology, curriculum development, organization, etc.) developed in recent years, it would seem that the educational and training program staff of the Probation Department, in conjunction with other department staff, and program and development people from the Center for Educational Opportunity, could devise and maintain in an experimental capacity, alternative systems of training and education in specific camp or school locations. The peculiar difficulties confronting educators in the Probation Department program need to be thoroughly examined in the light of existing possibilities in education, and so a combination of survey research (to determine the relative utility, efficiency and effectiveness of present systems) and experimentation with newly devised alternative programs would seem to be necessary. One possibility would involve contracting out the educational program of a particular camp or school to an agency such as the CEO, to be closely watched and evaluated in relation to the relative effectiveness and cost of other Department programs. Another would involve developing particular curricula, or training program components, or methods (e.g., team teaching, multi-media systems, programmed learning technologies) within particular schools in camp, and testing results both over time within the schools, and between schools offering material comparable in content. A third approach would be to devise and institute a systems wide innovation (e.g., ETV in English) incorporating into the experiment a carefully designed evaluation program.

Of course such programs could be combined or developed singly, but the one requisite element in each would involve thoroughgoing research both within the alternative model, or innovative program, and without in the control school or class, or prior in time to the innovation. In fact, a thorough research effort into the nature of the existing programs, their application and effects would in and of itself be a major undertaking, and one well worthy of support.

Community Based Educational Opportunity Programs

No correctional or rehabilitational program will work for a delinquent unless and until the community to which he must return accepts him and supports him. If a man is turned out, trained, ready and able to work--or to attend school--and a place is not made for him, it ought not surprise anyone that he not survive long in the community. Perhaps the most important, most immediately useful means of effecting positive change in a delinquent is to ensure him some sort of equal opportunity upon return to the community. In order to so ensure a youth, steps must be taken to provide support beyond the detention camp gates. Such steps now are provided by probation officers on duty in the community. But a wider variety of alternative futures for youth in detention facilities would seem on the face of it to provide more and better opportunity for successful involvement in community life. Besides the probation officer, there are now available a host of government and privately financed programs which could be utilized (as was Upward Bound this last summer) by imaginative administrators as host institutions for released delinquents, and they, together with the probation officer, could assume responsibility for the behavior of their charges.

Such a program would supplement the standard probation casework system, but it is not enough. Recent experiments in other programming operations have proven to be successful, and in combination with a system delivering ensured educational opportunities, they could prove quite useful in the Probation Department's menu of alternative futures for their wards. There is no apparent reason why the Guided Group Interaction model cannot be utilized in a setting oriented towards education. In fact the Kentfields program in Grand Rapids, Michigan proved so successful, operating in just such a fashion, that it was in part taken over by the school district and operates therein under the title of College-Fields. But most such programs emphasize work, and there is an apparent need to develop program models that include education (broadly conceived) as a central element.

Another approach holds promise, and is in part much closer to what was actually attempted in Upward Bound at Claremont. Given a conventional role in society, and assuming its responsibilities, the delinquent will find within himself the springs of change which will enable him to develop conventional social behaviors.

Two halfway houses could be developed, each of which would operate along the lines of either the Guided Group Interaction mode, or the Synanon derived model, using the delinquent as a change agent. Both of course would require and promote education in place of work (though work would also be necessary--at least part time) as a central treatment modality. Both would cooperate closely with the Probation Department, and would require extensive evaluation apparatus. A term in either could serve, if properly organized, as a substitute for incarceration.

Short of developing particular programs for delinquent youth, means could be devised whereby all available educational opportunity programs in a given area could be surveyed, and places for delinquents reserved therein, thus providing a richer variety of community resources to the Probation Department, and ensuring capable wards of the Department alternative opportunities upon release from detention.

Conclusion

Of course this is not an exhaustive categorization of possibilities for extending educational opportunities to delinquent youth. It is but a beginning. An ideal program would consist of a widely varied and infinitely flexible series of such programs, and would require sure and thorough knowledge of the individual delinquent and the available programs. Such a program is possible and ought to be strived for, although we are all aware it is not likely to be achieved soon.

Nonetheless, an attempt such as was made in the Center for Educational Opportunity Upward Bound/Los Angeles County Probation Department program in the summer of 1969 appears as a sure harbinger of good things to come. To develop an argument for innovation in juvenile reform programs, is to base it on a cost effectiveness approach, and I am certain the programs suggested above would altogether prove less expensive and more effective than presently operating systems. Whatever additional cost is entailed in development would, I believe, be saved many times over in the end.

Bibliography

Among sources consulted the following proved most useful.

Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Juvenile Delinquency & Youth Crime, (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1967).

Richard Claword & Lloyd Ohlin, Delinquency & Opportunity, (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960).

John P. Conrad, Crime and its Correction, (Berkeley, California: The University of California Press, 1965).

Paul W. Keve, Imaginative Programming in Probation and Parole, (Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1967).

Maxwell Jones, The Therapeutic Community, (New York: Basic Books, 1953).

H. Ashley Weeks, Youthful Offenders at Highfields, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1958).

Lloyd W. McCorkle, Ebos, & Bixby, The Highfields Story, (Harbinger Press).

Don C. Gibbons, Changing the Lawbreaker, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1965).

Derek Miller, Growth to Freedom, (Bloomington, Indiana: Cordova University Press, 1964).

Howard W. Polsky & Daniel S. Claster, The Dynamics of Residential Treatment (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1968).

David Street, Vintor & Perrou, Organization for Treatment (New York: Free Press, 1966).

William E. Amos, Movella & Southwell, Action Programs for Delinquency Prevention, (Springfield, Illinois, Charles C. Thomas, 1965).

Samuel R. Slauson, Reclaiming the Delinquent, (New York: Free Press, 1965).

Seymour Rukenfield, Family of Outcasts, (New York: Free Press, 1965).

David Metzar, Delinquency & Drift (New York: John Wiley & Son, 1964).

Robert M. MacIver, The Prevention & Control of Delinquency (New York: Atherton Press, 1966).

Belton M. Fleisher, The Economics of Delinquency, (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1966).

David M. Downes, The Delinquent Solution (New York: Free Press, 1966).

Travis Huschi & Horor C. Selvin, Delinquency Research (New York: Free Press, 1967).